

REMARKS

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement of April 11, 2005 in which the Examiner restricted the claims to Groups I and II. In addition the Examiner issued a species restriction as well.

The Examiner did not restrict claims 21-24. However, these claims are dependent from elected claim 1 and are believed to be properly within Group I.

Applicant believes that the restriction requirement is not appropriate. Examiner asserts that the alleged inventions of Group I and II are unrelated because it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and that they have different modes of operation, different functions or different effects. It is believed that this assessment is overly technical. The claims of Groups I and II are closely related inasmuch as both include a central processing platform, and perform similar functions.

With respect to the species restriction, it is noted that the communications species are related, namely e-mail and a website embodiments. The third species asserted by the Examiner is dependent on the first two recited species.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider his restriction and withdraw the same.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By: 

John P. DeLuca
Registration No. 25,505
Franklin Square, Third Floor West
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3353
(202) 906-8626